arXiv:1610.06697v1 [math.FA] 21 Oct 2016

Reproducing pairs and Gabor systems at critical density

Michael Speckbacher and Peter Balazs*

Abstract

We use the concept of reproducing pairs to study Gabor systems at critical density. First, we present a generalization of the Balian-Low theorem to the reproducing pairs setting. Then, we prove that there is no reproducing partner for the Gabor system of integer time-frequency shifts of the Gaussian. In other words, the coefficients for this Gabor expansion of a function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ cannot be calculated using inner products with an arbitrary family of vectors in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. This solves the possibly last open question for this system.

MSC2010: 42C15, 42C40
Keywords: Gabor systems, reproducing pairs, critical density, Zak transform, Balian-Low theorem
Submitted to: Transactions of the AMS

1 Introduction

The main objective of Gabor analysis is to understand the conditions and obstructions on the family $G(g, \Lambda) := \{T_{\lambda_1} M_{\lambda_2} g\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R})$ to be a frame. There exists, however, a great abundance of windows g and lattices Λ generating Gabor families which are, on the one hand, complete and, on the other hand, violate at least one of the frame bounds. The well-known Balian-Low theorem, for example, states that the window function of a Gabor frame at critical density ($\Lambda = a\mathbb{Z} \times a^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$) cannot be well localized on the time-frequency plane. In fact, there are many more properties of a window function that prevent a system from being a Gabor frame, see [15] for an overview. It is therefore reasonable to change perspective and apply approaches beyond frame theory to Gabor families at critical density.
Several generalizations of frames, such as semi-frames or reproducing pairs have been introduced. A reproducing pair [22] consists of two vector families (not necessarily frames) instead of a single one and represents a bounded

*Acoustics Research Institute, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Wohllebengasse 12-14, 1040 Vienna, Austria, E-mail: speckbacher@kfs.oeaw.ac.at, peter.balazs@oeaw.ac.at

and invertible analysis/synthesis process in a Hilbert space. Observe that, for Gabor families, there is a conceptual similarity to weakly dual Gabor systems [12], where the analysis/synthesis process is seen in terms of a Gelfand triplet.

The main incentive for this paper is to investigate whether the obstructions for Gabor frames at critical density still hold for reproducing pairs. First, we will consider the case of reproducing pairs consisting of two Gabor systems and derive a Balian-Low like result. Then we will turn our focus on the study of the Gabor family of integer time-frequency shifts of the Gaussian φ which is probably the most studied object in Gabor analysis.

Already in 1932, von Neumann [23] claimed without proof that the system $\mathcal{G} := \{T_k M_l \varphi\}_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is complete in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. It was only in the 1970's that Perelomov [20], Bargmann et al. [7] and Bacry et al. [6] presented rigorous proofs of the completeness in the context of coherent states.

A second problem was formulated by Gabor [13] in 1946 when he asked if there exists a linear coefficient map $A : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}}$, such that the expansion

$$f = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} (Af)(k,l) T_k M_l \varphi, \tag{1}$$

converges for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. The answer to this question is more subtle. Janssen [16] showed that such a coefficient map exists. The coefficients, however, grow polynomially and (1) converges in the sense of tempered distributions.

As the Balian-Low theorem tells us that $\mathcal{G}$ cannot be a frame one might ask if there is a dual window $\gamma \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, such that $(Af)(k,l) = \langle f, T_k M_l \gamma\rangle$ in (1). The answer is "no". This can easily be seen using Zak transform methods which results in Bastiaans' dual window [8], a bounded function that is not in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for any $1 \leq p < \infty$. Moreover, it is a consequence of the Balian-Low like result that we will show in Section 3.

In this paper, we will consider a problem that is intermediate to the second and third question and that is so far unsolved: can the coefficient map A be calculated using inner products with an arbitrary family in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, that is, is there a system $\Psi = \{\psi_{k,l}\}_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}}$, such that $(Af)(k,l) = \langle f, \psi_{k,l}\rangle$ with the series (1) converging weakly?

We will use a characterization of the existence of reproducing pairs from [5] in our proof to show that there is no such family. This result can be reformulated in several contexts. For example, there is no dual system for the complete Bessel-sequence $\mathcal{G}$, or there is no family of vectors Ψ making $(\mathcal{G}, \Psi)$ a reproducing pair.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present basics of reproducing pairs and Gabor theory needed in the course of this article. Section 3 is devoted reproducing pairs of two Gabor systems and a generalization

of the Balian-Low theorem. In Section 4 we investigate the existence of a reproducing partner for the system $\mathcal{G}$.

2 Preliminaries and notation

Let $\omega \in [0,1)^d$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We denote the Fourier transform of a function $f : [0,1)^d \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}(f)[k] = \int_{[0,1)^d} f(\omega) e^{-2\pi i k\cdot\omega} d\omega,$$

and the discrete-time Fourier transform of a sequence $c : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_d(c)(\omega) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} c[k] e^{-2\pi i k\cdot\omega}.$$

2.1 Frames and semi-frames

Frames have been introduced in 1952 by Duffin and Schaeffer [10] as a generalization of orthonormal bases. A countable family of vectors $\{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ in a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is called a frame if there exist constants $A, B > 0$ such that

$$A \|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} |\langle f, \psi_k\rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2, \ \forall\ f \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{2}$$

For a thorough introduction to frame theory, see [9]. Frame theory has proven its usefulness in many different fields like sampling theory [1] or theoretical physics [2]. However, it is sometimes impossible to satisfy both frame bounds at the same time. We will see an example of this situation in Section 2.3. Because of this, several generalizations of frames like reproducing pairs (see Section 2.2) or semi-frames [3, 4] have been introduced. The basic idea of semi-frames is to consider complete families $\{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ that only satisfy one of the inequalities in (2). In particular, $\{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ is called a lower semi-frame if

$$A \|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} |\langle f, \psi_k\rangle|^2, \ \forall\ f \in \mathcal{H}, \tag{3}$$

and is called an upper semi-frame if

$$0 < \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} |\langle f, \psi_k\rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2, \ \forall\ f \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{4}$$

An upper semi-frame is sometimes also called a complete Bessel sequence. Many results from frame theory can be extended to the setting of semi-frames.
The following Lemma can be found in [3, Lemma 2.5].

Lemma 1 *Let $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ be an upper semi-frame with bound B, and $\Psi = \{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a family of vectors satisfying*

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle f, \phi_k\rangle\langle \psi_k, g\rangle, \quad \forall\ f, g \in \mathcal{H},$$

then Ψ is a lower semi-frame with lower bound B^{-1}.

2.2 Reproducing pairs

The concept of reproducing pairs has been introduced recently in [22] and studied in more detail in [5]. The idea of is to omit both frame bounds and to consider two families of vectors (instead of a single one) that generate a bounded and boundedly invertible analysis/synthesis process.
Although the general definition [5] is given with respect to arbitrary Borel measures, we present only a discrete setting here as we will study discrete Gabor systems throughout this paper.

Definition 1 *Let $\Psi = \{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$, $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ be two families in $\mathcal{H}$. The pair (Ψ, Φ) is called a reproducing pair for $\mathcal{H}$ if the operator $S_{\Psi,\Phi} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$, weakly given by*

$$\langle S_{\Psi,\Phi} f, g\rangle := \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle f, \psi_k\rangle\langle \phi_k, g\rangle, \tag{5}$$

is bounded and boundedly invertible.
Given a family Ψ, any system Φ for which (Ψ, Φ) is a reproducing pair is called a reproducing partner for Ψ.

Let $\mathcal{V}_\Phi(\mathcal{I})$ be the space of all sequences $\xi : \mathcal{I} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \xi[k]\langle \phi_k, g\rangle \right| \leq c\, \|g\|\ , \forall\, g \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Hence, Riesz representation theorem guarantees that the synthesis operator $D_\Phi : \mathcal{V}_\Phi(\mathcal{I}) \to \mathcal{H}$, weakly given by

$$\langle D_\Phi \xi, g\rangle = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \xi[k]\langle \phi_k, g\rangle,$$

is well-defined. By definition, $\mathcal{V}_\Phi(\mathcal{I})$ is the most general domain such that the synthesis operator converges weakly. The proof of the following result can be found in [5, Theorem 4.1]. It answers the question of the existence of a reproducing partner for a given family in a Hilbert space.

Theorem 2 *Let $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a family of vectors and $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$. There exists another family Ψ, such that*

(Ψ, Φ) *is a reproducing pair if, and only if, (a)* $\mathsf{Ran}\, D_\phi = \mathcal{H}$ *and (b) there exists a family* $\{\xi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \subset \mathcal{V}_\Phi(\mathcal{I})$ *such that*

$$D_\Phi \xi_k = e_k, \ \forall\ k \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} |\xi_k[n]|^2 < \infty, \ \forall\ n \in \mathcal{I}. \tag{6}$$

A possible reproducing partner $\Psi = \{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ *is then given by*

$$\psi_n := \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \overline{\xi_k[n]} e_k.$$

The conditions (a) and (b) can be interpreted in several ways. Property (a) ensures the existence of a linear operator $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{V}_\Phi(\mathcal{I})$ satisfying $f = D_\Phi A(f)$, for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$. For an example of a complete system that does not satisfy (a), see [5, Section 6.2.3]. Property (b) guarantees that $A(f)$ can be calculated by taking inner products of f with a second family $\Psi \subset \mathcal{H}$. Secondly (a) and (b) guarantee that $\{\xi_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{I}}$ is an orthonormal basis of its closed linear span with respect to the inner product $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_\Phi := \langle D_\Phi \xi, D_\Phi \eta \rangle$. The second condition of (b) then assures that this space is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space.

2.3 Gabor analysis

Let $\lambda = (x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be a point on the time-frequency plane, a time-frequency shift of a function g by λ is given by

$$\pi(\lambda) g(t) := T_x M_\omega g(t) = e^{2\pi i \omega (t-x)} g(t-x).$$

The short-time Fourier transform V_g of a function f is then given by

$$V_g f(\lambda) := \langle f, \pi(\lambda) g \rangle.$$

A Gabor system is a discrete family of functions generated by time-frequency shifts of a single window function $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$

$$G(g, \Lambda) := \{\pi(\lambda) g\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}.$$

Let $a, b > 0$, the Gabor system using a rectangular lattice is given by

$$G(g, a, b) := \{T_{an} M_{bm} g\}_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}}.$$

The product ab is called the density, and $(ab)^{-1}$ is called the redundancy of the Gabor system. If $G(g, a, b)$ is a frame, then $ab \leq 1$ necessarily holds, see [14, Corollary 7.5.1]. The case $ab = 1$ is called critical density. To keep notation simple, we write for short $g_{an,bm} := T_{an} M_{bm} g$.

The Balian-Low theorem states that, at critical density, there are no Gabor frames using a window which is well-localized both in time and frequency.

Theorem 3 (Amalgam Balian-Low Theorem) *Let $ab = 1$ and the Gabor system $G(g, a, b)$ be a frame, then both $g \notin W_0(\mathbb{R})$ and $\hat{g} \notin W_0(\mathbb{R})$, where*

$$W_0(\mathbb{R}) := \{f \in C(\mathbb{R}) : \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x\in[0,1]} |f(x+n)| < \infty\}.$$

This obstruction motivates the approach of using reproducing pair methods to study Gabor systems of well localized windows at critical density. First, we will investigate if it is possible to choose another Gabor system as the reproducing partner. Such a family necessarily satisfies the lower but not the upper frame bound by Lemma 1 which implies that the generating window function cannot be well localized. Second, we will use Theorem 2 to check the existence of arbitrary reproducing partners.
The analysis of the conditions of Theorem 2 depends heavily on the particular window. We will thus focus on the system of integer time-frequency shift ($a = b = 1$) of the normalized Gaussian

$$\varphi_\sigma(t) = (2/\sigma)^{1/4} e^{-\pi t^2/\sigma}.$$

However, we are convinced that the recipe for our proof also works for other window functions. As in [17, Section 2.2] we will assume that $\sigma = 1$ and use the notation $\varphi := \varphi_1$ and $\mathcal{G} := G(\varphi, 1, 1)$.

We end this introductory part to Gabor system with defining the modulation spaces M^1_v. Let v be a submultiplicative weight greater or equal to one and g be some nonzero Schwartz function, then M^1_v is defined as follows

$$M^1_v := \left\{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : \ V_g f \in L^1_v(\mathbb{R}^2)\right\}.$$

These spaces are commonly seen as the appropriate class of window functions for Gabor analysis. For an overview on modulation spaces, see [11].

3 A Balian-Low like theorem for reproducing pairs

The Zak transform of a function f is given by

$$Z_a f(x, \omega) := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} f(x - ak) e^{2\pi i a\omega k}.$$

We list several important properties of the Zak transform. An extensive description can be found for example in [14, Chapter 8]. It is easy to see that $Z_a f$ is periodic in the second variable and quasiperiodic in the first variable, that is, for $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ one has

$$Z_a f(x + ak, \omega + l/a) = e^{2\pi i a k\omega} Z f(x, \omega).$$

Moreover, $Z_a : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^2(\mathcal{Q}_a)$ is a unitary operator, where $\mathcal{Q}_a := [0, a] \times [0, 1/a]$. Regularity of a function is preserved by the Zak transform. To be more precise, if $f \in W_0(\mathbb{R})$, then $Z_a f \in C(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and if $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, then $Z_a f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. The most important property of the Zak transform in the context of Gabor analysis is, however, the diagonalization of the Gabor frame operator. For $ab = 1$, $f, g, \gamma \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, it holds

$$Z_a(S_{g,\gamma} f) = a \cdot \overline{Z_a g} \cdot Z_a \gamma \cdot Z_a f. \tag{7}$$

Hence, $(G(g, a, 1/a), G(\gamma, a, 1/a))$ is a reproducing pair if, and only if,

$$0 < m \leq |Z_a g \cdot Z_a \gamma| \leq M < \infty, \text{ almost everywhere,}$$

and $S_{g,\gamma} = I$ if, and only if, $\overline{Z_a g} \cdot Z_a \gamma = 1/a$, almost everywhere.
The proof of the Amalgam Balian-Low theorem is based on the observation that, if $Z_a g$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^2$, then $Z_a g$ has a zero in $\mathcal{Q}_a$.

Example 1 *We try to "trick" the Amalgam Balian-Low theorem by constructing a reproducing pair using window functions g, γ such that $g \in W_0(\mathbb{R})$, that is, g is well localized on the time-frequency plane. Observe that γ is then necessarily badly localized. Define $\vartheta(t) := t^{1/4}(1-t)^{1/4}$, $t \in [0, 1]$, and*

$$Z_a g_a(x, \omega) := e^{2\pi i x/a \cdot (a \cdot \omega \bmod 1)} \vartheta(a \cdot \omega \bmod 1),$$

then $Z_a g_a$ is quasiperiodic and continuous on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, $g_a \in W_0(\mathbb{R})$, $\widehat{g_a}(\omega) = \vartheta(a\omega) \cdot \chi_{[0,1/a]}(\omega) \in W_0(\mathbb{R})$ and $\gamma_a := Z_a^{-1}(1/\overline{Z_a g}) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Hence, $\big(G(g_a, a, 1/a), G(\gamma_a, a, 1/a)\big)$ is a reproducing pair for every $a > 0$.



Figure 1: Plot of the functions g_1 (left) and γ_1 (right) in Example 1. The solid (resp. dashed) line shows the real (resp. imaginary) part of the functions g_1 and γ_1.[1]

[1] In the spirit of reproducible research we provide a Matlab/Octave script at https://www.kfs.oeaw.ac.at/doc/RepPairGabor/rep_pair_gabor.m which generates the plots of Figure 1 and calculates the explicit values in Lemma 8 and Proposition 11.

It however turns out that the class of functions for which this trick works is rather small. In particular, we will show a Balian-Low like result for reproducing pairs for windows in some modulation space, see Corollary 6 . The following Proposition is a simple consequence of Janssen's characterization of the modulation space M^1 via the Zak transform [19].

Proposition 4 *Let $v_s(x,\omega) := (1+|x|+|\omega|)^s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $f \in M^1_{v_s}$, then $Z_a f \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$.*

Proof: Let $f \in M^1_{v_s}$ and $g_1, g_2 \in M^1_{v_s}$ such that $Z_a g_1$ and $Z_a g_2$ have no common zeros. By [19], $Z_a f \cdot \overline{Z_a g_n}$, $n = 1, 2$, can be expressed by an Fourier series

$$(Z_a f \cdot \overline{Z_a g_n})(x,\omega) = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} c_n(k,l) e^{2\pi i k x/a + 2\pi i a l \omega}, \ n = 1, 2,$$

with coefficients $\{c_n(k,l)\}_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^1_{v_r}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$. Hence, if $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \leq r$, $\{k^{\beta_1} l^{\beta_2} c_n(k,l)\}_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ which in turn implies that the Fourier series of the derivative

$$D^\beta(Z_a f \cdot \overline{Z_a g_n})(x,\omega) = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} (2\pi i)^{|\beta|} (k/a)^{\beta_1} (al)^{\beta_2} c_n(k,l) e^{2\pi i k x/a + 2\pi i a l \omega},$$

converges absolutely for all $|\beta| \leq r$. Hence, $Z_a f \cdot \overline{Z_a g_n} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$,for $n = 1, 2$. We may choose g_1, g_2 to be Schwartz functions which guarantees that $Z_a g_n \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. As $Z_a g_1$ and $Z_a g_2$ have no common zeros, it follows that $Z_a f \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$. □

Lemma 5 *Let $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^2(\mathcal{Q}_a)$ such that there exists $z^* \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ with $F(z^*) = 0$, then $1/F \notin L^2(\mathcal{Q}_a)$.*

Proof: Let $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with zero $z^* \in \mathcal{Q}_a$, then by Taylor's theorem

$$F(z) = \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} F(z^*) + H_1(z)\Big)(z_1 - z_1^*) + \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} F(z^*) + H_2(z)\Big)(z_2 - z_2^*),$$

where H_1, H_2 converge to zero as $z \to z^*$. As H_1, H_2 are continuous in z^*, it follows that there exist $\delta > 0$ such that $\max\{|H_1(z)|, |H_2(z)|\} < \varepsilon$ for all $z \in B_\delta(z^*)$. Hence,

$$|F(z)|^2 \leq C\|z - z^*\|^2, \ \forall z \in B_\delta(z^*).$$

Consequently, $1/F \notin L^2([0,1]^2)$, as $1/|F(z)|^2 \geq C\|z - z^*\|^{-2}$ on $B_\delta(z^*)$. □

Corollary 6 *Let $g, \gamma \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$f = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle f, T_{ak} M_{l/a} g\rangle T_{ak} M_{l/a} \gamma, \ \forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

that is, $\big(G(g,a,1/a), G(\gamma,a,1/a)\big)$ is a reproducing pair, then both $g \notin M^1_{v_1}$ and $\gamma \notin M^1_{v_1}$.

Proof: Assume without loss of generality that $g \in M^1_{v_1}$, then $Z_a g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by Proposition 4 and $Z_a\gamma = 1/\overline{Z_a g}$ by (7). However, $Z_a\gamma \notin L^2(\mathcal{Q}_a)$ by Lemma 5 and consequently $\gamma \notin L^2(\mathbb{R})$, a contradiction. □

4 In quest of a reproducing partner for $\mathcal{G}$

For the rest of this paper, we focus on the study of $\mathcal{G}$. By Corollary 6, there is no Gabor system being a reproducing partner for $\mathcal{G}$. We will use Theorem 2 to answer the question if the expansion coefficients can be calculated via inner products.
By [6, 7, 20], $\mathcal{G}$ is total and, by [14, Corollary 6.2.3], Bessel, that is, $\mathcal{G}$ forms an upper semi-frame but not a frame. Any dual system is therefore necessarily a lower semi-frame by Lemma 1.
A first step in the direction of finding the expansion coefficients for $\mathcal{G}$ can be found in [8]. In this paper, Bastiaans constructed a window that yields the expansion coefficients for a dense subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ was presented, see also [18, Section 4.4]. However, Bastiaans dual window is not in square integrable. In fact, it is not $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ integrable for any $1 \le p < \infty$.

4.1 The range of $D_{\mathcal{G}}$

Condition (a) in Theorem 2 is satisfied. This is a consequence of [16, Theorem 4.7], which states that for every $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ there exists a sequence ξ such that $f = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi[k,l] T_k M_l \varphi$ with convergence in $\mathcal{S}'$-sense. Consequently, the series converges weakly for every $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ by density of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, that is, $\mathsf{Ran}\, D_{\mathcal{G}} = L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

In order to study condition (b), that is, if there exists $\{\xi_{k,l}\}_{(k,l)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ such that $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi_{k,l} = e_{k,l}$ and $\sum_{k,l} |\xi_{k,l}[n,m]|^2 < \infty$, for all $(n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, some preparatory work is necessary.

4.2 Solving $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = e_{n,m}$

Lemma 7 *Let $\gamma \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. The sequence ξ_0 is a (weak) solution to $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma$ if, and only if, $\mathcal{S}_{n,m}\xi_0$ is a (weak) solution to $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma_{n,m}$, where $S_{n,m}$*

denotes the index-shift operator

$$\mathcal{S}_{n,m}c[k,l] := c[k-n, l-m].$$

Proof: Let ξ_0 be a (weak) solution to $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n,m} &= T_n M_m \gamma = T_n M_m (T_{\mathcal{G}}\xi_0) = T_n M_m \Big(\sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi_0[k,l] T_k M_l \varphi \Big) \\ &= \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi_0[k,l] T_{k+n} M_{l+m}\varphi = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi_0[k-n,l-m] T_k M_l \varphi \\ &= \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{S}_{n,m}\xi_0)[k,l] T_k M_l \varphi = D_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}_{n,m}\xi_0).\end{aligned}$$

The reversed implication follows with the same argument. □

Hence, in order to find all solutions of $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma_{n,m}$, it remains to find one particular weak solution of $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma$ and characterize the kernel of $D_{\mathcal{G}}$ in $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$.

4.2.1 Characterizing the kernel of $D_{\mathcal{G}}$

In this section we will show that any weak solution of $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = 0$ is given by a two dimensional polynomial of order not greater than four evaluated on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. This extends Janssen's result that any solution is a polynomial of finite order [16].
As $\mathcal{G}$ is total in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ it follows that $\xi \in \mathsf{Ker}\, D_{\mathcal{G}}$ if, and only if, $\langle D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi, \varphi_{n,m}\rangle = 0$, for every $(n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi, \varphi_{n,m}\rangle &= \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi[k,l]\langle T_k M_l \varphi, T_n M_m \varphi\rangle = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi[k,l]\langle T_{k-n} M_{l-m}\varphi, \varphi\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \xi[k,l]\vartheta[n-k, m-l] = (\xi * \vartheta)[n,m],\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\vartheta[n,m] := \langle T_{-n} M_{-m}\varphi, \varphi\rangle = (-1)^{nm} e^{-\pi(n^2+m^2)/2},$$

and the last equality holds by [14, Lemma 1.5.2].
Let $\xi * \vartheta = 0$, then $\mathcal{F}_d(\xi)\cdot\mathcal{F}_d(\vartheta) = 0$ holds at least in the sense of periodic distributions. Hence, we intend to characterize those periodic distributions Λ such that $\Lambda\cdot\Theta = 0$, where $\Theta := \mathcal{F}_d(\vartheta)$. The function Θ can be expressed analytically as

$$\Theta(\omega) = \sum_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} (-1)^{nm} e^{-\pi(n^2+m^2)/2} e^{-2\pi i(n\omega_1 + m\omega_2)} \tag{8}$$

$$= \theta_3(\pi\omega_1, e^{-\pi/2})\cdot\theta_3(2\pi\omega_2, e^{-2\pi}) + \theta_4(\pi\omega_1, e^{-\pi/2})\cdot\theta_2(2\pi\omega_2, e^{-2\pi}),$$

where $\omega \in [0,1)^2$ and θ_k denotes the k-th Jacobi theta function, see for example [24]. This function has been studied in [16, Theorem 3.5]. We will state the results and add a result on the second and fourth partial derivatives.
Throughout the rest of this paper we will make use of multi-indices to denote partial derivatives. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $\alpha_n \geq \beta_n$ for all $n = 1, ..., d$, then $D^\alpha F := \dfrac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_{x_d}^{\alpha_d}}$, where $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_d$, and the binomial coefficient is given by

$$\binom{\alpha}{\beta} := \binom{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} \cdot \binom{\alpha_2}{\beta_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot \binom{\alpha_d}{\beta_d}.$$

Lemma 8 *Set $\omega_0 := (1/2, 1/2)$. The function $\Theta \in C^\infty([0,1]^2)$ has the following properties:*

(i) $\Theta(\omega) \geq 0, \ \forall\ \omega \in [0,1)^2$,

(ii) $\Theta(\omega) = 0$ *if, and only if,* $\omega = \omega_0$,

(iii) $D^{(2,0)}\Theta(\omega_0) = D^{(0,2)}\Theta(\omega_0) > 0$,

(iv) whenever k or l is odd, then $D^{(k,l)}\Theta(\omega_0) = 0$,

(v) for every $k \in 2\mathbb{N}_0$, it holds

$$D^{(k,2)}\Theta(\omega_0) = D^{(2,k)}\Theta(\omega_0) \neq 0,$$

and

$$D^{(k,4)}\Theta(\omega_0) = D^{(4,k)}\Theta(\omega_0) \neq 0.$$

Proof: The statements (i) - (iv) were shown in [16, Theorem 3.5]. It remains to prove (v). It follows directly from (8) that the partial derivatives of Θ at ω_0 can be written as

$$D^{(k,l)}\Theta(\omega_0) = (-2\pi i)^{k+l} \sum_{n,m \in \mathbb{Z}} n^k m^l e^{-\pi(n^2+m^2)/2} (-1)^{n+m+nm}.$$

If m is even, then

$$(-1)^{n+m+nm} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for n even} \\ -1, & \text{for n odd.} \end{cases}$$

If m is odd, then $(-1)^{n+m+nm} = -1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence,

$$(-2\pi i)^{-(k+l)} D^{(k,l)}\Theta(\omega_0)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n n^k e^{-\pi n^2/2} \sum_{m \in 2\mathbb{Z}} m^l e^{-\pi m^2/2} - \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} n^k e^{-\pi n^2/2} \sum_{m \in 2\mathbb{Z}+1} m^l e^{-\pi m^2/2},$$

which implies that the partial derivative of Θ at ω_0 is zero if, and only if,

$$Q(k) := \frac{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}(-1)^n n^k e^{-\pi n^2/2}}{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} n^k e^{-\pi n^2/2}} = \frac{\sum_{m\in 2\mathbb{Z}+1} m^l e^{-\pi m^2/2}}{\sum_{m\in 2\mathbb{Z}} m^l e^{-\pi m^2/2}} =: P(l).$$

The value $P(2)$ (resp. $P(4)$) can be calculated numerically and equals approximately 27.83 (resp. 6.96). On the other hand, $|Q(k)| \leq 1$, for every $k \in 2\mathbb{N}_0$ which concludes the proof. □

A particular consequence of Lemma 8 is that any periodic distribution Λ satisfying $\Lambda \cdot \Theta = 0$ is supported on $\{\omega_0\}$. Thus, by [21, Theorem 6.25] there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and coefficients $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\Lambda = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N} c_\alpha D^\alpha \delta_{\omega_0}. \tag{9}$$

The partial derivative of a periodic distribution Γ is given by the distribution $D^\alpha\Gamma$ satisfying

$$D^\alpha\Gamma(\varphi) = (-1)^{|\alpha|}\Gamma(D^\alpha\varphi),\ \forall\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

The Leibniz rule then implies that, for $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$, it holds

$$F\cdot\Lambda = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N}\sum_{\beta\leq\alpha}(-1)^{|\alpha-\beta|}c_\alpha\binom{\alpha}{\beta}D^\beta F(t_0)D^{\alpha-\beta}\delta_{t_0}. \tag{10}$$

Lemma 9 *Let $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}^d$ such that $F(t_0) = 0$ and $F(t) \neq 0$, for all $t \in B_\varepsilon(t_0)\backslash\{t_0\}$. Moreover, let T_n be the Taylor polynomial of F of order n at t_0. If*

(i) $\Lambda = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N} c_\alpha D^\alpha\delta_{t_0}$,

(ii) $F\cdot\Lambda = 0$,

(iii) $T_n(t_0) \neq 0$, *for all* $t \in B_\varepsilon(t_0)\backslash\{t_0\}$,

then for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ satisfying $|\alpha| = N - n$, it holds

$$\sum_{|\beta|=n} c_{\alpha+\beta}\binom{\alpha+\beta}{\beta}D^\beta F(t_0) = 0. \tag{11}$$

If in addition, $D^\beta F(t_0) = 0$, for all $|\beta| < n$, then (11) holds for every $|\alpha| \leq N - n$.

Remark 10 *The proof of Lemma 9 is based on applying (10) to the Taylor polynomial of F and equating coefficients. As we could not find any reference for Lemma 9, we included the proof in the appendix.*

The previous auxiliary Lemma provides conditions on the coefficients c_α in (9) to satisfy $\Lambda \cdot \Theta = 0$.

Proposition 11 *Every solution $\Lambda \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T}^2)$ of $\Theta \cdot \Lambda = 0$ is given by*

$$\Lambda = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 4} c_\alpha \cdot D^\alpha \delta_{\omega_0}, \tag{12}$$

where the coefficients c_α satisfy the following conditions

(a) $c_{2,0} + c_{0,2} = 0$ (c) $3c_{0,3} + c_{2,1} = 0$ (e) $c_{4,0} = c_{0,4} = c_{2,2} = 0.$
(b) $c_{3,1} + c_{1,3} = 0$ (d) $3c_{3,0} + c_{1,2} = 0$

Proof: Let us denote $\beta_1 := (2,0)$ and $\beta_2 := (0,2)$. By Lemma 8 we know that $D^\alpha\Theta(\omega_0) = 0$ for $|\alpha| \leq 1$, $D^{(1,1)}\Theta(\omega_0) = 0$, $D^{\beta_1}\Theta(\omega_0) = D^{\beta_2}\Theta(\omega_0) > 0$, and consequently $T_2(\omega) > 0$, for every $\omega \neq \omega_0$. Thus, for every $|\alpha| \leq N-2$, Lemma 9 implies

$$c_{\alpha+\beta_1}\binom{\alpha+\beta_1}{\beta_1} + c_{\alpha+\beta_2}\binom{\alpha+\beta_2}{\beta_2} = 0. \tag{13}$$

In particular, the statements $(a)-(d)$ hold.
Let us assume that $N \geq 4$. Since $T_2(\omega) > 0$, for every $\omega \neq \omega_0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $T_4(\omega) > 0$, for all $\omega \in B_\varepsilon(\omega_0)\backslash\{\omega_0\}$. Hence, for every $|\alpha| = N-4$ it holds

$$\sum_{|\gamma|=4} c_{\alpha+\gamma}\binom{\alpha+\gamma}{\gamma} D^\gamma\Theta(\omega_0) = 0.$$

Recall that $D^{(1,3)}\Theta(\omega_0) = D^{(3,1)}\Theta(\omega_0) = 0$ by Lemma 8, implying that for every $|\alpha| = N-4$,

$$\sum_{k\in\{1,2,3\}} c_{\alpha+\gamma_k}\binom{\alpha+\gamma_k}{\gamma_k} D^{\gamma_k}\Theta(\omega_0) = 0, \tag{14}$$

where $\gamma_1 := 2\beta_1 = (4,0)$, $\gamma_2 := 2\beta_2 = (0,4)$ and $\gamma_3 := \beta_1 + \beta_2 = (2,2)$. Moreover, using the base points $\alpha+\beta_1$ and $\alpha+\beta_2$, with $|\alpha| = N-4$, in equation (13), yields the two additional conditions

$$c_{\alpha+\gamma_1}\binom{\alpha+2\beta_1}{\beta_1} + c_{\alpha+\gamma_3}\binom{\alpha+\beta_1+\beta_2}{\beta_2} = 0, \tag{15}$$

and

$$c_{\alpha+\gamma_2}\binom{\alpha+2\beta_2}{\beta_2} + c_{\alpha+\gamma_3}\binom{\alpha+\beta_1+\beta_2}{\beta_1} = 0. \tag{16}$$

Solving the system of linear equations (14) - (16) leads to

$$\frac{(\alpha+\gamma_2)!}{4\alpha!}\big(D^{\gamma_3}\Theta(\omega_0) - 2D^{\gamma_1}\Theta(\omega_0)\big)c_{\alpha+\gamma_3} = 0.$$

As $D^{\gamma_3}\Theta(\omega_0) - 2D^{\gamma_1}\Theta(\omega_0)$ is approximately equal to 1442.17, it follows that

$$c_{\alpha+\gamma_1} = c_{\alpha+\gamma_2} = c_{\alpha+\gamma_3} = 0.$$

If we assume that Λ is of order $N > 4$, then, for every $|\beta| = N$, there exists $|\alpha| = N - 4$, such that $\beta = \alpha + \gamma_k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Thus, $c_\beta = 0$ for every $|\beta| = N$ which contradicts the assumption. Let Λ be of order $N = 4$, the only $|\alpha| = N - 4$ is $\alpha = (0, 0)$ and therefore $c_{4,0} = c_{0,4} = c_{2,2} = 0$, that is, (e) holds. □

Applying the inverse Fourier transform to Λ given in (12) immediately shows the following result.

Corollary 12 *Every sequence $p \in \mathsf{Ker}\, D_{\mathcal{G}}$ can be written as*

$$p[n, m] = \sum_{k+l\leq 4} c_{k,l} \cdot n^k m^l,$$

where the coefficients $c_{k,l}$ satisfy the following conditions

(a) $c_{2,0} + c_{0,2} = 0$ (c) $3c_{0,3} + c_{2,1} = 0$ (e) $c_{4,0} = c_{0,4} = c_{2,2} = 0.$
(b) $c_{3,1} + c_{1,3} = 0$ (d) $3c_{3,0} + c_{1,2} = 0$

In particular,

$$p[n, 0] = \sum_{k\leq 3} c_{k,0} \cdot n^k.$$

4.2.2 Calculation of ξ_0

We choose the orthonormal basis $\{e_{n,m}\}_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in Theorem 2 to be the Gabor system $G(\gamma, 1, 1)$ with $\gamma := \chi_{[-1/2,1/2]}$. By Lemma 7 it remains to find a weak solution of $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma$.

Bastiaans' dual window [8] is analytically given by

$$\psi(t) = C_\psi\ e^{\pi t^2} \sum_{n>|t|-1/2} (-1)^n e^{-\pi(n+1/2)^2}, \tag{17}$$

with some positive constant C_ψ. The function ψ is defined as the inverse Zak transform of 1 over the Zak transform of the Gaussian, that is, $\psi = Z^{-1}(1/Z(\varphi))$ and has the property that ψ is bounded but not contained in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for any $1 \leq p < \infty$, that is, $\psi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})\backslash L^p(\mathbb{R})$.

Janssen showed in [18, Section 4.4] that, for every $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $|\langle f, T_k M_l \psi\rangle| \to 0$, for every fixed $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|k| \to \infty$, the following series converges in the sense of tempered distributions

$$f = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle f, T_k M_l \psi\rangle T_k M_l \varphi. \tag{18}$$

We will prove that this condition implies weak convergence for a dense subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 13 *For every function $f \in \mathcal{M}$, where*

$$\mathcal{M} := \Big\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : \ f = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} c[k,l] T_k M_l \gamma, \ \|c\|_1 < \infty \Big\},$$

equality (18) holds weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, $\xi_0[k,l] := \langle \gamma, T_k M_l \psi\rangle$ is a weak solution of $T_{\mathcal{G}}\xi = \gamma$.

Proof: Recall that $G(\gamma, 1, 1)$ is an orthonormal basis. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}$, then $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as

$$\|f\|_1 \le \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} |c[k,l]| \|T_k M_l \gamma\|_1 = \|c\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_2^2 = \sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} |c[k,l]|^2 \le \|c\|_1^2.$$

Let $k \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \gamma, T_k M_l \psi\rangle| &\le \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |\psi(t-k)| dt \le C \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi(t-k)^2} dt \sum_{n\ge|k|} e^{-\pi(n+1/2)^2} \\
&= C \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi(t-|k|)^2 - \pi(|k|+1/2)^2} dt \sum_{n\ge|k|} e^{-\pi(n+1/2)^2 + \pi(|k|+1/2)^2} \\
&\le C \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi(t^2 - 1/4 - |k|(2t+1))} dt \le C \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{-\pi|k|(2t+1)} dt \\
&= \frac{C}{2\pi|k|}(1 - e^{-2\pi|k|}) \le \frac{C}{2\pi(1+|k|)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $e^{\pi t^2}$ is even and that $t^2 - 1/4 < 0$ on $(-1/2, 1/2)$. Observe that the constant C is independent of k as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n\ge|k|} e^{-\pi(n+1/2)^2 + \pi(|k|+1/2)^2} &= \sum_{n\ge0} e^{-\pi(n+|k|+1/2)^2 + \pi(|k|+1/2)^2} \\
&= \sum_{n\ge0} e^{-\pi(n^2+2n|k|+n)} \le \sum_{n\ge0} e^{-\pi(n^2+n)} = C < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Let now $f = \sum_{n,m} c[n,m] T_n M_m \gamma$ with $c \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^2)$. By Young's inequality for convolutions and previous calculations we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, T_k M_l \psi\rangle|^2 &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big| \sum_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} c[n,m] \langle \gamma, T_{k-n} M_{l-m} \psi\rangle \Big|^2 \\
&\le C \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big(\sum_{n,m\in\mathbb{Z}} |c[n,m]| (1+|k-n|)^{-1} \Big)^2 \\
&= C \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} c[n,m] \Big) (1+|k-n|)^{-1} \Big)^2 \\
&\le C \|c\|_1^2 \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (1+|n|)^{-2} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This estimate finally implies that for fixed $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|\langle f, T_k M_l \psi\rangle| \to 0$, as $|k| \to \infty$. □

Let us investigate the behavior of ξ_0 in more detail. Thereby, we will use the notation $g(t) := C_\psi e^{\pi t^2}$,

$$G_k := \sum_{n\ge 0} (-1)^n e^{-\pi(n^2+2|k|n+|k|+n+1/4)},$$

and $\mu_k(t) := (-1)^k e^{-\pi|k|} G_k e^{-2\pi k t}$. It holds, using Lemma 13

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_0[k,l] = \langle \gamma, T_k M_l \psi\rangle &= C_\psi \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi(t-k)^2} e^{-2\pi i l t} dt \sum_{n\ge|k|} (-1)^n e^{-\pi(n+1/2)^2} \\
&= C_\psi \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi t^2} e^{-2\pi k t} e^{-2\pi i l t} dt \sum_{n\ge|k|} (-1)^n e^{-\pi(n+1/2)^2} e^{\pi k^2} \\
&= C_\psi \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi t^2} e^{-2\pi k t} e^{-2\pi i l t} dt \sum_{n\ge 0} (-1)^{n+k} e^{-\pi(n^2+2|k|n+|k|+n+1/4)} \\
&= C_\psi (-1)^k e^{-\pi|k|} G_k \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{\pi t^2} e^{-2\pi k t} e^{-2\pi i l t} dt \\
&= \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} g(t) \mu_k(t) e^{-2\pi i l t} dt = \mathcal{F}(g \cdot \mu_k)[l]. \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

For $k = 0$, the Fourier transform of μ_0 is given by $\mathcal{F}(\mu_0)[l] = G_0 \delta_0[l]$. Let

$k \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(\mu_k)[l] &= (-1)^k e^{-\pi|k|} G_k \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{-2\pi(k+il)t} dt \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{k+1} e^{-\pi|k|} G_k}{2\pi(k+il)} (e^{-\pi(k+il)} - e^{\pi(k+il)}) \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{l+k+1}}{2\pi(k+il)} (e^{-\pi(|k|+k)} - e^{-\pi(|k|-k)}) G_k \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{l+k}}{2\pi(k+il)} \mathrm{sgn}(k)(1 - e^{-2\pi|k|}) G_k \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{l+k}}{2\pi(k+il)} H_k, \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

where $H_k := \mathrm{sgn}(k)(1-e^{-2\pi|k|})G_k$. Observe that $H_k \to \pm e^{-\pi/4}$ as $k \to \pm\infty$.

4.3 Existence of reproducing partners

The following definition will provide a necessary condition for the convergence of a series in $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Definition 2 *We say that a subset $I \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ possesses property (D) if*

$$\frac{|I \cap B_r^\infty|}{|B_r^\infty|} \to 1, \ \textit{as } r \to \infty, \qquad (21)$$

where $B_r^\infty := \{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \max(|k|,|l|) \leq r\}$.

Note that, if a finite collection of index sets $I_1, I_2, ..., I_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfies (D), then $\bigcap_{n=1}^N I_n$ also satisfies (D). To see this, let I_1 and I_2 possess property (D), then

$$\frac{|B_r^\infty \cap (I_1 \cap I_2)^c|}{|B_r^\infty|} = \frac{|(B_r^\infty \cap I_1^c) \cup (B_r^\infty \cap I_2^c)|}{|B_r^\infty|} \leq \frac{|B_r^\infty \cap I_1^c|}{|B_r^\infty|} + \frac{|B_r^\infty \cap I_2^c|}{|B_r^\infty|} \to 0,$$

which implies that (D) holds for $I_1 \cap I_2$.

Remark 14 *Let $\{a_{k,l}\}_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, if the series*

$$\sum_{(k,l)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{a_{k,l}}{1+k^2+l^2}$$

converges, then it follows that the index set

$$I(\varepsilon) := \{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ a_{k,l} < \varepsilon\}$$

satisfies (D), for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

We are now able to prove our main result. We will thereby use an argument based on Remark 14.

Theorem 15 *There is no reproducing partner for $\mathcal{G}$, the system of integer time-frequency shifts of the Gaussian. In other words, $\mathcal{G}$ is a complete Bessel sequence with no dual.*

Proof: Set $\xi_{k,l} = \mathcal{S}_{k,l}\xi_0 + p_{k,l}$, where $p_{k,l} \in \mathsf{Ker}\, D_{\mathcal{G}}$, then $D_{\mathcal{G}}\xi_{k,l} = \gamma_{k,l}$. Let us assume that there exist a reproducing partner for $\mathcal{G}$. By Theorem 2, we can choose $\{\xi_{k,l}\}_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in such a way that

$$\sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\xi_{k,l}[n,m]\right|^2 < \infty, \ \forall\ n,m \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{22}$$

Recall that, by Corollary 12, $p_{k,l}$ is given by

$$p_{k,l}[n,m] = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} c_{\alpha,k,l} \cdot n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2}.$$

As we assume (22), we can apply Parseval's formula to the summation with respect to $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. By (19) and (20) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\xi_{k,l}[n,m]\right|^2 &= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\mathcal{S}_{k,l}\xi_0[n,m] + p_{k,l}[n,m]\right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\xi_0[n-k,m-l] + p_{k,l}[n,m]\right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\mathcal{F}(g\cdot\mu_{n-k})[m-l] + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} c_{\alpha,k,l}\cdot n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2}\right|^2 \\
&= \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left|M_m(g\cdot\mu_{n-k})(-\omega) + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{F}^{-1}(c_{\alpha,k,\cdot})(\omega)\right|^2 d\omega \\
&\geq |g(0)|^2 \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left|M_m\mu_{n-k}(-\omega) + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2} (\mathcal{F}^{-1}(c_{\alpha,k,\cdot})/g)(\omega)\right|^2 d\omega \\
&= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\mathcal{F}(\mu_{n-k})[m-l] + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{F}\big(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(c_{\alpha,k,\cdot})/g\big)[l]\right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \left|\frac{(-1)^{n+k+l+m} H_{n-k}}{2\pi(n-k+i(m-l))} + \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{F}\big(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(c_{\alpha,k,\cdot})/g\big)[l]\right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\left|A_{k,l}^{n,m}\right|^2}{(n-k)^2 + (m-l)^2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\left|A_{k,l}^{n,m}\right|^2}{1 + (n-k)^2 + (m-l)^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where

$$A^{n,m}_{k,l} := H_{n-k} + (-1)^{n+m} \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 4} n^{\alpha_1} m^{\alpha_2} \cdot \beta_\alpha(k,l) \cdot \Big(1 - \frac{n+im}{k+il}\Big)$$

and

$$\beta_\alpha[k,l] := 2\pi(-1)^{k+l+1} \mathcal{F}\big(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(c_{\alpha,k,\cdot})/g\big)[l] \cdot (k+il).$$

We will construct a contradiction for the case $m = 0$. Hence, using Corollary 12 and $A^n_{k,l} := A^{n,0}_{k,l}$ yields

$$A^n_{k,l} = H_{n-k} + (-1)^n \sum_{\alpha_1 \leq 3} n^{\alpha_1} \cdot \beta_{\alpha_1}[k,l] \cdot \Big(1 - \frac{n}{k+il}\Big).$$

By (23), we know that if

$$\sum_{(k,l)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} |\xi_{k,l}[n,0]|^2 < \infty, \text{ then } \sum_{(k,l)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{\big|A^n_{k,l}\big|^2}{1+(n-k)^2+l^2} < \infty. \tag{24}$$

Remark 14 tells us that this is the case only if $I_{A,n}(\varepsilon) := \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \big|A^n_{k,l}\big| < \varepsilon\big\}$ satisfies (D) for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Instead of proving that $I_{A,n}(\varepsilon)$ cannot satisfy (D) for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we will do so for $I_{B,n}(\varepsilon) := \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \big|B^n_{k,l}\big| < \varepsilon\big\}$, where

$$B^n_{k,l} := H_{n-k} + (-1)^n \sum_{\alpha_1 \leq 3} n^{\alpha_1} \cdot \beta_{\alpha_1}[k,l], \tag{25}$$

and show that this is an equivalent statement.

Lemma 16 *The set $I_{A,n}(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (D) for all $\varepsilon > 0$ if, and only if, $I_{B,n}(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (D) for all $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof: Let $|n|/|k+il| < \varepsilon \ll 1$. If $(k,l) \in I_{B,n}(\varepsilon)$, then

$$\big|A^n_{k,l}\big| \leq \Big(1 + \frac{|n|}{|k+il|}\Big)\big|B^n_{k,l}\big| + \frac{|nH_{n-k}|}{|k+il|} \leq (1+\varepsilon)\varepsilon + C\varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, if $(k,l) \in I_{A,n}(\varepsilon)$, then

$$\big|B^n_{k,l}\big| \leq \big|A^n_{k,l}\big| + \frac{|nB^n_{k,l}|}{|k+il|} + \frac{|nH_{n-k}|}{|k+il|} \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon|B^n_{k,l}| + C\varepsilon,$$

which implies that

$$\big|B^n_{k,l}\big| \leq \frac{1+C}{1-\varepsilon}\varepsilon.$$

Finally, the result follows as $\big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ |n|/|k+il| < \varepsilon\big\}$ satisfies (D) for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

In the following, we will construct a finite collection of index sets that necessarily possess property (D) if (22) holds and subsequently show that their intersection is empty, a contradiction.
As we assume that (22) holds, it follows by Lemma 16 that $I_{B,n}(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (D) for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$. Recall that H_{n-k} converges to $-e^{\pi/4}$ (resp. $e^{\pi/4}$) as $k \to +\infty$ (resp. $k \to -\infty$). We therefore set

$$\Delta_n(\varepsilon) := \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \big|H_{n-k} + \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}\big| < \varepsilon\big\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\Delta_n(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (D) for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$.
Let $n = 0$ and define

$$\Pi_0(\varepsilon) := \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \big|\beta_0[k,l] - \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}\big| < \varepsilon\big\}.$$

If $(k,l) \in \Delta_0(\varepsilon) \cap I_{B,0}(\varepsilon)$, then triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_0[k,l] - \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}| &\le |H_{-k} + \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}| + |H_{-k} + \beta_0[k,l]| \\ &= |H_{-k} + \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}| + |B^0_{k,l}| < 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(k,l) \in \Pi_0(2\varepsilon)$ and consequently $\Pi_0(2\varepsilon) \supseteq \Delta_0(\varepsilon) \cap I_{B,0}(\varepsilon)$. This implies that $\Pi_0(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (D) for all $\varepsilon > 0$.
Let $n = 1$ and define

$$\Pi_1(\varepsilon) := \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \big|(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)[k,l] + 2 \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}\big| < \varepsilon\big\}.$$

If $(k,l) \in \Delta_1(\varepsilon) \cap I_{B,1}(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_0(\varepsilon)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)[k,l] + 2 \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}| \\ &\le |B^1_{k,l}| + |\beta_0[k,l] - \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}| + |H_{1-k} + \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}| < 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

With the same argument as before, $\Pi_1(3\varepsilon) \supseteq \Delta_1(\varepsilon) \cap I_{B,1}(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_0(\varepsilon)$, and thus $\Pi_1(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (D) for all $\varepsilon > 0$.
Repeating the arguments from the case $n = 1$ for $n \in \{-2, -1, 2\}$ shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{-1}(\varepsilon) &:= \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \big|(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3)[k,l] + 2 \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(k) e^{-\pi/4}\big| < \varepsilon\big\}, \\ \Pi_2(\varepsilon) &:= \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \big|(2\beta_1 + 4\beta_2 + 8\beta_3)[k,l]\big| < \varepsilon\big\}, \\ \Pi_{-2}(\varepsilon) &:= \big\{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \ \big|(-2\beta_1 + 4\beta_2 - 8\beta_3)[k,l]\big| < \varepsilon\big\}, \end{aligned}$$

all satisfy (D) for every $\varepsilon > 0$.
Let $(k,l) \in \Pi_1(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_{-1}(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_2(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_{-2}(\varepsilon)$ and assume without loss of generality that $\operatorname{sgn}(k) = 1$, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 2 & 4 & 8 \\ -2 & 4 & -8 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1[k,l] \\ \beta_2[k,l] \\ \beta_3[k,l] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2e^{-\pi/4} + \delta_1 \\ -2e^{-\pi/4} + \delta_2 \\ \delta_3 \\ \delta_4 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{26}$$

for some vector $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\sup_{i=1,..,4} |\delta_i| < \varepsilon$.
If ε is small enough, then there exists no solution of this linear equation. Hence, $\Pi_1(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_{-1}(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_2(\varepsilon) \cap \Pi_{-2}(\varepsilon) = \emptyset$. In particular, there is $n^* \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$, such that $\Pi_{n^*}(\varepsilon)$ does not satisfy (D), which in turn implies that $I_{B,n^*}(\varepsilon)$ does not satisfy (D). Remark 14, Lemma 16 and (24) thus yield a contradiction to (22). □

5 Conclusion

We have shown that there is no reproducing partner for the system of integer time-frequency shifts of the Gaussian. The crucial point in our argument is to bound the order of the polynomials in $\mathsf{Ker}\, D_{\mathcal{G}}$. Otherwise we could not derive the system of linear equations in (26) leading to a contradiction. Applying the same recipe to other window functions, that is, calculate ξ_0, characterize the maximal degree of the polynomials in $\mathsf{Ker}\, D_{\Phi}$, and finally construct a contradiction, seems promising to us.
It seems as if the obstructions to Gabor frames as portrayed for example in [15] also exist if one leaves the frame setup. In particular, we have shown a Balian-Low like result in the more general setup of reproducing pairs of Gabor families.
However, we believe that the concept of reproducing pairs, despite the results for the Gabor setup, provides new insights on general complete vector systems. In particular, the characterization of Theorem 2 has proven to be a helping tool when studying such systems.

Acknowledgement

This work was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) START-project FLAME ('Frames and Linear Operators for Acoustical Modeling and Parameter Estimation'; Y 551-N13). The authors would like to thank Tomasz Hrycak for valuable discussions.

A Appendix

Lemma 17 *Let $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $F(t_0) = 0$ and $F(t) \neq 0$, for all $t \in B_\varepsilon(t_0)\backslash\{t_0\}$ and T_n the Taylor polynomial of F with order n at t_0. If*

(i) $\Lambda = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} c_\alpha D^\alpha \delta_{t_0}$,

(ii) $F \cdot \Lambda = 0$,

(iii) $T_n(t_0) \neq 0$, *for all* $t \in B_\varepsilon(t_0)\backslash\{t_0\}$.

For every $|\alpha| = N - n$ *it holds*

$$\sum_{|\beta|=n} c_{\alpha+\beta} \binom{\alpha+\beta}{\beta} D^\beta F(t_0) = 0. \tag{27}$$

If in addition, $D^\beta F(t_0) = 0$*, for all* $|\beta| < n$*, then* (27) *holds for every* $|\alpha| \leq N - n$*.*

Proof: We may assume that $t_0 = 0$. T_n is given by

$$T_n := \sum_{|\alpha|\leq n} \frac{1}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha F(0))t^\alpha.$$

By (iii), $\Psi := F/T_n \in C^\infty(B_\varepsilon(0))$ and

$$F\Lambda = \Psi T_n \Lambda = 0.$$

Since $\Psi(0) = 1$ by Taylor's theorem, and $T_n\Lambda$ is supported on $\{0\}$, it follows that

$$T_n\Lambda = 0. \tag{28}$$

Recall that

$$(D^\alpha t^\beta)(0) = \begin{cases} \alpha! & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which implies that

$$(D^\alpha T_n)(0) = \begin{cases} D^\alpha F(0) & \text{if } |\alpha| \leq n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

Hence, using Remark 10 to expand $T_n\Lambda$ and $\gamma := \alpha - \beta$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} T_n\Lambda &= \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N} \sum_{\beta\leq\alpha} (-1)^{|\alpha-\beta|} c_\alpha \binom{\alpha}{\beta} D^\beta T_n(0) D^{\alpha-\beta}\delta_0 \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \sum_{\beta\leq\alpha} (-1)^{|\alpha-\beta|} c_\alpha \binom{\alpha}{\beta} D^\beta F(0) D^{\alpha-\beta}\delta_0 \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N} \sum_{|\gamma|\leq N-k} (-1)^{|\gamma|} D^\gamma \delta_0 \sum_{|\beta|=k} c_{\gamma+\beta} \binom{\gamma+\beta}{\beta} D^\beta F(0) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{|\gamma|\leq N-k} (-1)^{|\gamma|} D^\gamma \delta_0 \sum_{|\beta|=k} c_{\gamma+\beta} \binom{\gamma+\beta}{\beta} D^\beta F(0), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (29). The derivatives of δ_0 of order $N - n$ only appear if $k = n$. Thus, by (28) it follows that (27) holds for every $|\gamma| = N - n$.

Finally, if $D^\beta F(t_0) = 0$, for all $|\beta| < n$, then

$$T_n\Lambda = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N-n} (-1)^{|\alpha|}(D^\alpha\delta_0) \sum_{|\beta|=n} c_{\alpha+\beta}\binom{\alpha+\beta}{\beta} D^\beta F(0).$$

Hence, (27) holds for every $|\alpha| \leq N - n$. □

Proof of Lemma 9: Distributions on the circle $\mathbb{T}$ can be seen as 2π-periodic distributions on $\mathbb{R}$. In particular,

$$\Lambda = \sum_{p=0}^{N} c_p \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \delta^{(p)}_{t_0+2\pi k}.$$

The rest of the proof goes almost exactly as the proof of Lemma 17, only replace $F = \Psi T_n$ by $F = \Psi\Gamma_n$, where $\Gamma_n \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a 2π-periodic function satisfying $\Gamma_n = T_n$ in a neighborhood of t_0. □

References

[1] A. Aldroubi and K. Gröchenig. Non-uniform sampling and reconstruction in shift-invariant spaces. *SIAM Review*, 43:585–620, 2001.

[2] S. T. Ali, J-P. Antoine, and J-P. Gazeau. *Coherent States, Wavelets and their Generalizations.* Graduate texts in contemporary physics. Springer, 2nd edition, 2014.

[3] J-P. Antoine and P. Balazs. Frames and semi-frames. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 44(20):205201, 2011.

[4] J-P. Antoine and P. Balazs. Frames and semi-frames, Corrigendum. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 44:479501, 2011.

[5] J-P. Antoine, M. Speckbacher, and C. Trapani. Reproducing pairs of measurable functions. *submitted to: Acta Appl. Math.*, 2015. arXiv:1505.04187v2.

[6] H. Bacry, A. Grossmann, and J. Zak. Proof of completeness of lattice states in the kq representation. *Phys. Rev. B*, 12(4), 1975.

[7] V. Bargmann, P. Butera, L. Girardello, and J. R. Klauder. On the completeness of the coherent states. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 2(4):221–228, 1971.

[8] M. J. Bastiaans. Gabor's expansion of a signal into Gaussian elementary signals. *Proc. IEEE*, 68(4):538–539, 1980.

[9] O. Christensen. *An Introduction to Frames and Riesz Bases.* Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Birkhäuser, 2003.

[10] R. J. Duffin and A. C. Schaeffer. A class of nonharmonic Fourier series. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 72:341–366, 1952.

[11] H. G. Feichtinger. Modulation spaces: Looking back and ahead. *Samp. Theory Signal Image Process.*, 5:109–140, 2006.

[12] H. G. Feichtinger and G. Zimmermann. A Banach space of test functions for Gabor analysis. In H.G. Feichtinger and T. Strohmer, editors, *Gabor analysis and Algorithms - Theory and Applications.* Birkhäuser Boston, 1998.

[13] D. Gabor. Theory of communication. Part 1: The analysis of information. *J. Inst. Electr. Eng. 3*, 93:429–441, November 1946.

[14] K. Gröchenig. *Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis.* Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal. Birkhäuser Boston, 2001.

[15] K. Gröchenig. The mystery of Gabor frames. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 20(4):865–895, 2014.

[16] A. J. E. M. Janssen. Gabor representation of generalized functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 83:377–394, 1981.

[17] A. J. E. M. Janssen. Weighted Wigner distributions vanishing on lattices. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 80:156–167, 1981.

[18] A. J. E. M. Janssen. Bargmann transform, Zak transform, and coherent states. *J. Math. Phys.*, 23(5):720–731, 1982.

[19] A. J. E. M. Janssen. Zak transform characterization of S_0. *Samp. Theory Signal Image Process.*, 5(2):141–162, 2006.

[20] A. M. Perelomov. On the completeness of a system of coherent states. *Theoret. Math. Phys.*, 6(2):156–164, 1971.

[21] W. Rudin. *Functional analysis.* International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. McGraw-Hill Inc., New York, second edition, 1991.

[22] M. Speckbacher and P. Balazs. Reproducing pairs and the continuous nonstationary Gabor transform on LCA groups. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 48(395201), 2015.

[23] J. von Neumann. *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik.* Springer, Berlin, 1932. English translation: "Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics," Princeton Univ. Press, 1955.

[24] E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson. *A Course of Modern Analysis.* Cambridge University Press, 4th edition, 1996.